



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,929	12/29/2003	Lily Pao Looi	884.A82US1	6687

21186 7590 01/11/2007  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/749,929	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LOOI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Raymond Phan	<b>Art Unit</b> 2111	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 16-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

**Part III DETAILED ACTION**

***Notice to Applicant(s)***

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-28 are pending.
2. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2111.

***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9, 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mott et al. (US No. 6,574,695) in view of Burns et al. (US No. 7,000,042).

In regard to claims 1, 9, 20-21, 23-26, Mott et al. disclose an apparatus comprising a processor 21 (see figure 1); an bridge location 30 (see figure 1); a memory coupled to the expander memory bridge location; and a controller 24 including intercept logic to intercept and block communication from the processor to the bridge location and to emulate an expander memory bridge (see col. 7, lines 30-50). But Mott et al. do not specifically disclose the expander memory bridge location. However Burns et al. disclose the expander 160 connected the I/O

controller and the memory (see col. 5, lines 41-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Burns et al. within the system of Mott et al. because it would allow a plurality of storage devices to be grouped into various array configurations on isolated bus segment.

In regard to claims 2, 22, Mott et al. disclose wherein the controller includes a disable intercept logic bit (see col. 7, lines 30-56).

In regard to claim 3, Mott et al. disclose wherein the memory includes a mirror configuration (see col. 7, lines 30-56).

In regard to claims 4, 28, Burns et al. disclose wherein the memory includes a redundant array of independent memories (see col. 2, lines 10-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Burns et al. within the system of Mott et al. because it would allow a plurality of storage devices to be grouped into various array configurations on isolated bus segment.

In regard to claim 5, Mott et al. disclose wherein the processor includes a complex instruction set processor (see col. 3, lines 47-60).

In regard to claim 6, Mott et al. disclose wherein the bus controller includes an expander memory bridge plugged-in bit (see col. 7, lines 50-65).

In regard to claim 7, Mott et al. disclose wherein the memory includes a double data rate memory (see col. 3, lines 47-60).

In regard to claim 8, Mott et al. disclose further comprising an operating system to operate in cooperation with the processor, the operating system free of support for hot-pluggable components (see col. 4, lines 19-43).

In regard to claims 16, 18, Mott et al. disclose further removing the device, if the device is installed (see col. 6, lines 24-56).

In regard to claims 17, 19, Burns et al. disclose wherein removing the device, if the device is installed, includes removing a memory device (see col. 6, lines 49-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Burns et al. within the system of Mott et al. because it would allow a plurality of storage devices to be grouped into various array configurations on isolated bus segment.

In regard to claim 27, even though Mott et al. or Burns et al. do not specifically disclose wherein the display comprises a plasma display, however one skilled in the art would have understood that they can choose to have different type of display devices to fulfill their need.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 10-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 10, 13 are allowable over the prior art of record because the prior arts, cited in its entirety, or in combination, do not teach wherein intercepting and blocking the status request to the device, regardless of whether the device is installed, includes intercepting and blocking the status request during a configuration access to the device (claim 10); wherein responding to the status request includes responding that the device is available when the device is not installed (claim 13).

***Conclusion***

8. Claims 1-9, 16-28 are rejected. Claims 10-15 are objected.

9 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (571) 272-3632 or via e-mail addressed to mark.rinehart@uspto.gov. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [hop://pair-direct.uspto.gov](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov). Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 central telephone number is (571) 272-2100.



***Raymond Phan***  
***January 6, 2007***